


From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

PCT

COMMUNICATION IN CASES FOR WHICH
NO OTHER FORM IS APPLICABLE

To:

YOSHITAKE, Kenji
Kyowa Patent & Law Office
Room 323, Fuji Bldg.
2-3, Marunouchi 3-chome
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 1000005
JAPON



| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| Date of mailing (day/month/year) 18 April 2007 (18.04.2007) | | |
| Applicant's or agent's file reference 158961-471 | REPLY DUE | see paragraph 1 below |
| International application No. PCT/JP2006/307010 | International filing date (day/month/year) 28 March 2006 (28.03.2006) | |
| Applicant KABUSHIKI KAISHA TOSHIBA et al | | |

1. REPLY DUE within months/days from the above date of mailing
- NO REPLY DUE, however, see below
- IMPORTANT COMMUNICATION
- INFORMATION ONLY

2. COMMUNICATION:

The International Bureau acknowledges receipt, on 3 April 2007(03.04.2007) of the applicant's informal comments on the written opinion of the International Searching Authority (Form PCT/ISA/237).

Please be informed that unless an international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II of the PCT) (Form PCT/IPEA/409) has been or is to be established, the International Bureau will communicate a copy of the submitted comments together with a copy of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I of the PCT) (Form PCT/IB/373) to each designated Office in accordance with Rule 93bis.1 but not before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date.

| | |
|---|--|
| The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70 | Authorized officer Kunz Akiko Facsimile No. +41 22 338 90 90 Telephone No. +41 22 338 71 56 |
|---|--|

Informal Comments

Applicants would like to comment on the international search report and the written opinion prepared by the International Searching Authority.

In the written opinion, the International Searching Authority states that claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10-13, 16, 17, 19, and 20 lack inventive step and claims 5, 6, 9, 14, 15, and 18 involve inventive step.

Applicants traverse the statement alleging the lack of inventive step for claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10-13, 16, 17, 19, 20.

The server device according to claim 1 provides the following features that the connection controller generates secret information which can be input to the input device and can be output by the output device on the basis of capability information of the input device and capability information of the output device. That is, the connection controller generates different kinds of secret information (e.g. operation information of the mouse, character string, image information, or voice information and so on), depending on the capability information of the input device and the capability information of the output device. These features of claim 1 are neither disclosed nor suggested in the documents cited by the International Searching Authority.

The cited documents (e.g. document D1) only disclose well known "CAPTCHA" (Completely Automated Public Turing test to tell Computers from Humans Apart) system in which a server sends specific kind of test data to an output device of a user terminal. When the response (same data as the test data) is received from an input device of the user terminal, the input device can be used for inputting data and the output device is used for outputting computed data of the server. That is, the "CAPTCHA" system does not change kinds (categories) of test data depending on the capabilities of the input device and output device of the user terminal.

On the contrary, the connection controller of claim 1 change kinds (categories) of secret information depending on the capabilities of the input device and output device unlike the "CAPTCHA" system. Accordingly, the connection controller of claim 1 is not disclosed in the cited documents. There is not also the motivation to reach a device with all features of claim 1 in combination with the "CAPTCHA" system, in the cited documents. The same reasoning is applicable to the corresponding independent claims 12 and 20.

As stated above, Applicants consider the independent claims 1, 12 and 20 involve inventive step. Furthermore, Applicants consider that since claims 2-4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, and 20 are directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, 12, and 20, these

claims also involve inventive step as well as claims 5, 6, 9, 14, 15, 18.

In the written opinion, the International Searching Authority also states that the application lacks unity of invention within the meaning of Article 17 (3)(a), since the single general concept linking together all the claims is a device according to claim 1 which lacks inventive step.

Applicants traverse the statement alleging the lack of the unity of invention.

Claim 1 involves inventive step as described before contrary to the statement of International Searching Authority alleging the lack of inventive step. Accordingly, all the claims including claim 1 are linked as to form a single general inventive concept and thus the application meets the unity of invention.